

### **REMARKS**

Claims 27-39 and 41-55 are now in this application.

Claim 27 has been amended by removing portions which caused the examiner to make the rejections of paragraphs 4 and 5. Also, the recitations of former claim 40, which was indicated to include allowable subject matter, have been incorporated into claim 27. Thus, claim 27, and the claims which depend on it, should now be allowable. Since claim 27 is now allowable, and since claim 27 is generic, claims 46-52 can thus be reinstated and allowed along with allowable claim 27.

In paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Office action, the examiner rejected claims 27-45 as anticipated by Radue, whereas in paragraph 10 the examiner indicated that claims 40-45 contain allowable subject matter. In view of the fact that the reference to Radue does not teach or make obvious the structure formerly recited in claim 40 and now recited in claim 27, it is assumed that paragraph 10 of the Office action is intended for the material of former claim 40.

New claim 53 has been added to replace the alternative language which has been removed from claim 27. In its present form, this language does not present an issue with respect to the claims being indefinite due to alternative language.

Claims 54 and 55 have been added to replace the language which has been deleted from claims 36 and 37 respectively.

With regard to paragraph 1 of the Office action, applicant's point out that figure 4 shows the solenoid valves 15 and 16 and not the inlet 31. Accordingly, contrary to what the examiner has indicated, element 32 should not appear in figure 4. Element 32 is a part of inlet 31, and

Appl. No. 10/520,108  
Amdt dated July 21, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of March 24, 2006

thus is shown properly in figures 2 and 5, as explained in paragraphs 38, 49 and 55 of the specification.

With regard to paragraph 2 of the Office action, applicant's point out that in paragraphs 49 and 50 of the specification, element 36 is recited to be an inlet bore and **not** a central bore. Thus, the showing as in figure 3 is correct, and contrary to the examiner's indication, no new drawings are needed to properly show the structure of the disclosure.

With regard to paragraph 3 of the Office action, applicant's point out that shoulder 58, as shown in figure 5, is part of element 11. This is recited in line 16 of paragraph 55 of the specification. For clarification also, we also point out that this structure, a shoulder which is acted on by the high pressure of the fuel, is a means for opening the injection valve, and further such structure and operation is common in the art.

With regard to paragraph 4 of the Office action, claim 27, at line 5, has been modified so as to overcome this issue.

With regard to paragraph 5 of the Office action, it is noted that in this amendment claim 27 has been revised by eliminating substantially the last three lines. This action should resolve the issue raised by the examiner in paragraph 5 of the Office action.

In applicants' view, amended claim 27 is generic to all of the species, figures 1-4a, figure 5, figure 7 and figure 8. Thus, if claim 27 allowed, as it should be since the material of allowable claim 40 has been added, all of the claims which depend on it should be reinstated and allowed therewith.

Appl. No. 10/520,108  
Amdt dated July 21, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of March 24, 2006

Since the last three lines of claim 27 have been deleted, to maintain consistency some phrases from each of claims 36 and 37 have also been deleted. These deleted portions have each been made the subject of claims 53-55 respectively.

Also, to maintain consistency, claim 41 has been made dependent on claim 53.

Since the structure formerly recited in claim 40 and indicated to be allowable has now been added to claim 27, it is apparent that claim 27 should now be allowable, and it is respectfully requested that the examiner proceed with such allowance.

In paragraph 8 the examiner rejected claims 30, 32, 33, 35, 37 and 39 as unpatentable over Radue.

With regard to claim 32, since the inlet throttle and outlet throttles of Radue are embodied within the same structure, they could not be rotated 90 degrees to each other without complete and unobvious revision of Radue's structure. Thus we point out that claim 32 recites even further structure which makes it allowable.


The Commissioner is authorized to charge a fee of \$100.00, for two additional dependent claims as specified in the fee schedule for 2006, and any/all fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account Number 07-2100.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge a fee of \$120.00, for a first month extension of time as specified in the fee schedule for 2006, and any/all fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account Number 07-2100.

Appl. No. 10/520,108  
Amdt dated July 21, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of March 24, 2006

For the above reasons, entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims are  
courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald E. Greigg  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 31,517  
**Customer No. 02119**

Date: July 21, 2006

GREIGG & GREIGG, P.L.L.C.  
1423 Powhatan Street, Suite One  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Tel. (703) 838-5500  
Fax. (703) 838-5554

REG/SLS/ja

J:\Bosch\R302844-1\06-07-21, R302844-1, Amdt re OA of Mar 24, 06.wpd